

REMARKS IN REPLY TO OFFICE ACTION

Claims 1-17 are pending in the present patent application. Applicant has cancelled claims 2, 8, and 17 and has amended claims 1, 3, and 9. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of all remaining claims in the present patent application in view of the amendments and remarks.

(I) REPLY TO OBJECTION OF DRAWINGS:

Applicant has designated legend - -Prior Art- - to Figures 1a, 1b, and 2 complying with § 1.84. Reference number 410 in Figure 4b has been moved to its correct location.

(II) REPLY TO REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102:

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Eliasson et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,837,484 stating:

As to claim 1, Eliasson et al. discloses, in figures 4-5, a dielectric barrier discharge-driven light source comprising (1) a first [4] and second [17] dielectric barrier which encloses a gas 9 (see col. 3, lines 55-61), (2) a first [1] and second [6] electrode coupled to an outside portion of the first and second dielectric barriers, and (3) stems [3] coupled to an inside portion of the first and second dielectric barriers.

As to claims 2 and 3, Eliasson et al. discloses in figure 4 and 5 that the first and second dielectric barriers have a flat-panel shape, which is circular.

As to claims 4 and 5, Eliasson et al. discloses that the stems (i) are comprised of quartz (see col. 3, line 31), and (ii) are inherently equidistant (see figure 4).

As to claim 6, Eliasson et al. discloses in figure 4 that the second electrode [6] is a mesh.

With regard to the first and second flat panel dielectric barriers, the Eliasson patent does not teach, describe, or suggest the flat panel coplanar dielectric barriers separated by stems connected via transfer foil technology. By contrast, Figure 4 of Eliasson and the detailed

description are silent on how the spacing pieces 3 are coupled, if at all, to the dielectric materials. In addition, the only teaching of the nature of the embodiment of Figure 4 of Eliasson is found in the prior art description, which teaches that the radiator is essentially a tube with a rectangular cross section. In such a case, the embodiment of Eliasson differs little from the prior art of the present application in that many such radiators would be required to illuminate a surface to be treated, such as is shown in Figure 2 of the present application. The claimed invention provides a patentably distinct apparatus where the length and width of the panels are substantially greater than the distance between the first and second panels.

Therefore, Eliasson does not teach, describe, or suggest a flat-panel shaped dielectric light source, and hence does not anticipate the claimed invention and in particular claim 1 as amended. Since dependent claims 3-7 depend on a now allowable base claim, their rejection has been overcome as well.

(III) REPLY TO REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

The Examiner has rejected claims 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eliasson et al., and claims 9-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eliasson et al. in view of Wedding, Sr. (U.S. Patent No. 5,793,158). These claims, being dependent on an allowable base claim, are themselves allowable.

The Examiner has rejected method claims 9-17 under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Eliasson in view of Wedding, Sr. Applicant respectfully disagree.

The teaching of Eliasson is notably silent on the method of making an apparatus that teaches the present invention as claimed in 9-17. There is no discussion of the claimed transfer foil technology and fusing step of the claimed stems in either Eliasson or Wedding.

CONCLUSION

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-17. Applicant has cancelled claims 2, 8 and 17, and amended claims 1, 3, and 9. Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1, 3-7, and 9-16 are patentably distinct from the prior art of record and in condition for allowance. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that these pending claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

COUDERT BROTHERS LLP

By 

J. D. Harriman II
Reg. No. 31,967
(213) 229-2900

RECEIVED

JUN 18 2003

OFFICE OF PETITIONS